

NATIONAL SENTIMENT
AND PATRIOTISM IN
THE NEW TESTAMENT

G. G. BUCKLER

Class

225.93


Book

B856

General Theological Seminary Library

CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK

Ex 9-24



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

NATIONAL SENTIMENT AND PATRIOTISM IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

by

GEORGINA G. BUCKLER

Gibson Prize Essay, 1916

COPIED FROM
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

CAMBRIDGE:
DEIGHTON BELL & CO., LIMITED

LONDON:
G. BELL & SONS, LIMITED

1917

225.93

B856

78038

LIBRARY OF THE
YVARELL
BOY WOM

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Definitions of Patriotism	1
Patriotism in N.T. days as shown by	
(1) Proselytes of the Covenant	3
(2) Proselytes of the Gate	3
(3) Pagans	4
Liberal treatment of Jews by foreign masters	5
Racial and religious intolerance chiefly found among Jews	9
Growth of nationalism in Jewish history	9
The Messianic hope	14
Zealots	16
Attitude towards Patriotism of	
(1) Our Lord. (a) The Kingdom of God	20
(b) The Messiahship	23
(c) The Law	25
(d) The Gentiles	28
(2) The Apostles	30
Conclusion	42

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The books principally consulted in writing this Essay are as follows :

JOSEPHUS. Works.

AUGUSTINE. De ciuitate Dei.

RODKINSON. History of the Talmud.

EDERSHEIM. Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah.

CHARLES. Religious Development between the Old and New Testaments.

SCHÜRER. History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ.

RAMSAY. St Paul the Traveller. The Church in the Roman Empire.

HASTINGS. Dictionary of the Bible. (Survey of Conditions at the time of Jesus Christ.) (Sanday.)

HASTINGS. Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels. (Nationality.)

KIRSOPP LAKE. The Stewardship of Faith.

W. TEMPLE. The Church and the Nation.

ZANGWILL. The War for the World.

WESTCOTT. Social Aspects of Christianity.

LIGHTFOOT. Galatians.

GORE. Romans. Ephesians.

NEUMANN. Der römische Staat und die allgemeine Kirche.

NATIONAL SENTIMENT AND PATRIOTISM IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

Probably never since the world began have National Sentiment and Patriotism loomed so large on the mental horizon as at present, when no less than fourteen nations are at war. And probably never has there been less unqualified acceptance of them as adequate springs of action. To the Roman "pro patria" was a reason for all things, but even to a Tory of the Tories this present war seems "a judgment on all Christendom for having allowed Nationalism to grow to such a height that it superseded the true devotion of the Catholic Church" (Lord Hugh Cecil at St Martin's in the Fields, August 4th, 1916). Zangwill puts it more tersely: "The Twentieth Century is an era of nationalism run mad" (*War for the World*, p. 338), and Nurse Cavell felt that Patriotism was "not enough." It ought surely therefore to be helpful as well as interesting to go back to the sources of the Christian religion which twelve out of the fourteen belligerent nations profess, and see what the New Testament teaches as to National Sentiment and Patriotism.

At the very outset it may be well to define the terms we are discussing, and for practical purposes National Sentiment may be taken as equivalent to Patriotism. The former has perhaps strictly speaking an ethnological

and linguistic, the latter a political and geographical basis, but as a matter of fact the national sentiment of patriots is generally compounded of all these elements—pride of race, pride of language (with the traditions it involves), loyalty to an approved government, and love for a special part of the earth's surface. So that in choosing a definition it will be enough to get one for the second term only. Now Patriotism is one of the qualities which most people have hitherto accepted unquestioningly as virtues, and it is therefore not a little surprising to find, on more careful investigation, that there have always been some dissentients from this view.

Murray's Dictionary gives us indeed from Berkeley's *Maxims concerning Patriotism* (1750) the obvious definition of a patriot as "One who heartily wisheth the public prosperity and doth...also study and endeavour to promote it"; but Horatio Smith (*Tin Trumpet*, 1836) is quoted as saying that Patriotism is "too often the hatred of other countries disguised as love of our own"; while going further back we get Dr Johnson's pronouncement that "Patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel" (Boswell, April 7, 1775); and Dryden's scathing summing up (*Abs. and Achit.* 965) "Never was patriot yet but was a fool." Nor is this opinion confined to the professional makers of epigrams. Ruskin somewhere treats Patriotism as merely a developed form of egotism. Lord Acton states that it consists in "the development of the instinct of self preservation into a moral duty" (*Hist. of Freedom and other Essays*). Lessing said of love of country: "It is to me at best a heroic weakness." Grant Allen (*The Woman who Did*) ventures to assert that "Patriotism is the one of these lowest vices which most often

masquerades in false garb as a virtue...Nothing more than collective selfishness." Prominent thinkers have also echoed Nurse Cavell's sentiment. Thus Bolingbroke in his *Patriot* (II. 100) long ago insisted that "Patriotism must be founded in great principles and supported by great virtues"; and in our own day Jaurès has taught us: "La vraie formule du patriotisme c'est le droit égal de toutes les patries à la liberté et à la justice, c'est le devoir pour tout citoyen d'accroître en sa patrie les forces de liberté et de justice."

Which then of all these various definitions are we to take in considering what Patriotism meant in the beginning of the Christian era? The answer to this must obviously depend on the differing psychologies of the peoples affected by the sentiment. In studying this point, though St Paul gives the spirit of the New Testament in the words "To the Jew first and also to the Gentile" (Rom. ii. 10), it will be more convenient to reverse the order and take the Gentile and his National Sentiment first.

The Gentiles in the New Testament are of three kinds—Greek-speaking Greeks, Greek-speaking Asiatics, and Latin-speaking Italians, especially Romans.

These again come under three heads:

(1) Some were Proselytes of the Covenant who had undergone a process of religious naturalisation and therefore were virtually Jews. The Talmud tells us that for such Proselytes the rites of initiation consisted of circumcision, a bath of purification and a sacrifice.

(2) A second class of Gentiles more or less affected by Judaism were the uncircumcised Proselytes of the Gate, also described as *σεβόμενοι* (τὸν Θεόν). These

attended Feasts at Jerusalem (John xii. 20) though kept on pain of death out of the Inner Temple Court (Dittenberger, *Or. Gr. Inscr.* 598). They frequented the synagogues (Acts xiii. 42) and a Roman centurion is said to have built one (Luke vii. 5). Their familiarity with the Old Testament is shown by Acts xv. 21, and also by St Paul's frequent quotations in addressing the Gentiles of Asia Minor and Rome. As *God-fearers* they were bound (so we may infer from the decision of the Jerusalem Council) to abstain from the moral impurity rampant in the heathen life of the day (Rom. i. 24 sqq.; 1 Cor. v. 9, 10; Eph. iv. 19; Col. iii. 5-7; 1 Th. iv. 5, and Roman satirists *passim*), and also from image worship which to the higher thinkers of the classical world was hardly less distasteful than to a Hebrew. In matters of personal intercourse, they seemed to the strict Jews unclean (Luke vii. 6; Acts x.).

(3) Finally, we have instances of men frankly heathen supporting the Jewish religion either from indifference or from respect. Ever since the days of Judas Maccabeus and his covenant with the Romans, the Jews had been singularly favoured by the Latin rulers of the world, especially by the Caesars. Josephus (*Ant.* xiv. 10) proudly enumerates the various decrees that issued from Rome and other pagan cities to give the Jews special privileges—their own law-courts (17), exemption from military service (12), the right to assemble together (24), and to observe the “holy festivals,” with “common suppers” and “contributions” forbidden to “other Bacchanal rioters” (8, and cf. *War*, vi. 6. 2), and above all, freedom to keep the Sabbath (25), even, as we know, when it interfered with legal business. We learn from Suetonius

(*Caes.* 84) that of all his subjects “*praecipue Judaei*” mourned Julius Caesar’s death. So it is quite natural to find that Pilate, cruel and anti-Jewish as he personally was, yielded to Christ’s accusers when they claimed “We have a law” (*John* xix. 7)—that Gallio and Claudius Lysias declined to pass judgment in matters of purely Jewish significance (*Acts* xviii. 12–17, xxiii. 26–29)—and that St Paul throughout his story is as a rule courteously treated by the Romans (*Acts* xxiv. 23, xxvii. 3, xxviii. 16, but *contr.* xvi. 22). Indeed, Josephus (*War.* v. 13. 6) and Philo (*Leg. ad Cai.* 37) inform us that, true to the non-exclusive spirit of Roman religion, Augustus and his wife and his son-in-law Agrippa actually sent offerings to the Temple at Jerusalem.

This tolerance is not peculiar to the Romans. The three classes of Gentiles of whom we have spoken as appearing in the New Testament were all in principle free from any desire to act as inquisitors over the beliefs of others, and even in the earlier history the oppression endured by the Jews since the fall of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah had been, with one great exception, political, not religious. Under the dominion first of Babylon and then of Persia, they were allowed full exercise of their religion, and if they adopted some of their conquerors’ ideas (e.g. Chaldaean angelology and the Parsee doctrines traced among the Essenes) this does not argue religious persecution but rather the reverse. The stories of intolerance in Daniel are probably anachronisms composed much later, at the time of what we have called the one great exception, i.e. the mad attempt of Antiochus Epiphanes (more rightly called *ἐπιμανής*, as Polybius says) to enforce Hellenism in Judaea and abolish the old

Hebrew religion with its circumcision and its Sabbath and its strict monotheistic worship. This led to the national rising under the Maccabees and the temporary restoration of Jewish independence. In later days, Pompey it is true sacrilegiously entered the Holy of Holies, and Caligula was only stopped by the prayers of Herod Agrippa I from setting up his own statue in the Temple (Philo, *Leg. ad Cai.* 35-41); but on the whole both the Seleucids and the Romans showed remarkable respect for Jewish idiosyncrasies. In the New Testament days the Sanhedrin at Jerusalem, defined by Schürer as "a native aristocratic Senate" (consisting apparently of the chief priests and elders who were mostly Sadducees—Acts v. 17, xxiii. 1-9,—and the Scribes, who were mostly Pharisees), acted as a High Court of Justice with rather undefined powers, but having probably power of life and death (though the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels* thinks their capital sentences needed Roman confirmation), and with authority to give orders to the synagogues in other cities (Acts ix. 2, xxii. 5). The Jews, we are told by Josephus, retained their own laws (*War*, vi. 6. 2), and when we read in the Jerusalem Gemara that forty years before the Temple was destroyed judgment in capital cases was *taken away* from Israel, it probably merely means *disused in practice*; so that to the words of the Jews before Pilate: "It is not lawful for us to put any man to death," we must mentally add "at the Feast" (John xviii. 31). This would, of course, retain for Jerusalem (which on the Roman side was, since 57 B.C., the capital of one of the five districts into which Gabinus, pro-Consul of Syria, divided Palestine) the hegemony over all the Jews throughout the world.

Furthermore, when Herod the Great became a *Rex Socius* of the Roman Empire, Judaea was independent in all affairs of home administration, including taxes. Only in external matters, of wars and treaties, and the providing of troops, was she subject to imperial jurisdiction. She did not even in the later years of Christ have a Legion stationed in her, and the soldiers of the Crucifixion were probably Syrian auxiliaries. In spite of this, the Jews hated the Herodian dynasty so much that they begged after the death of Herod the Great (4 B.C.) to be directly under Rome; yet when this request was granted ten years later, they at once began to sigh for their old freedom of national existence. By an unfortunate coincidence, all the procurators appointed from 6 to 41 A.D., and again from 44 to 70 A.D., were men of narrow minds and overbearing dispositions, who resided at Caesarea and rarely honoured Jerusalem by a visit. They had no sympathy with their subjects, and Pilate, for instance, outraged popular sentiment by taking the Roman money from the Treasury to build an aqueduct into Jerusalem (alluded to in Luke xiii. 4) and brought the Roman ensigns within the city walls. Still the relations between the Jews and the Romans, though often strained by rebellion on the one hand (Acts v. 36, 37 and xxi. 38) and cruel repression on the other (Luke xiii. 1), continued with tolerable smoothness till the Zealots or Canaanites were deliberately guilty of what Neumann (*Der römische Staat und die allgemeine Kirche*) calls "ein Manifest des Krieges."

We have seen how great was the religious toleration of Rome towards the Jews. Their peculiar tenets were humoured; Roman coins and standards in their land were without human heads; the cult of the Emperor, in which

as Lord Bryce (*Journal of Roman Studies*, 1915, Vol. v. Pt. 1) tells us, "only the monotheistic Jews and the monotheistic Christians refused to worship with the rest," was not enforced. Only one thing was required, the offering up of daily sacrifices and prayers in the Temple "for Caesar and the Roman people"—an established rite to which Josephus appeals as a proof of Jewish loyalty (*in Apion*. II. 6). When therefore the Nationalist party in Jerusalem refused this simple act of obedience, they raised the standard of revolt, and the War of 70 A.D., with its disastrous conclusion, became inevitable. But we ought not to forget what Josephus the Jew is for ever impressing on us, that it was his own people who were responsible for the war and not their Roman masters. Certainly throughout the first twenty-six books of the New Testament the Imperial rule is represented as on the whole fair and reasonable; it is only after the persecution of Christians by Domitian that Rome appears in the Book of Revelation as the Beast, and "Babylon the great Whore."

In the case of the other two classes of heathen Gentiles mentioned in the Gospels and Epistles, the Greeks and the Asiatics, the same amicable relations with the Jews prevail. Wise men come from the East to get information from Hebrew scholars (Matt. ii.); the people of Athens allow St Paul to dispute in Socratic fashion in the market-place (Acts xvii. 17); the Council of the Areopagus put him through a trial speech to see whether he can be licensed as a University lecturer (W. M. Ramsay, *St Paul the Traveller*); the "barbarous people" of Malta show the shipwrecked Jews "no little kindness" (Acts xxviii. 2), and the population of Lystra, in the uncouth "speech of

Lycaonia," hail Paul and Barnabas as gods (Acts xiv. 11). Though the Greeks might divide the world into Greeks and barbarians, and the Romans might have one word for *stranger* and *enemy*, yet for racial and religious intolerance we must turn not to the heathen but to the chosen people of God.

In order to substantiate this statement, we will give a rapid glance at the history of Israel before the Christian era. From the very beginning, the Jews, as the seed of Abraham and the followers of Yahweh, were pre-eminently marked by the Tribal Instinct which Lord Bryce (*Race Sentiment as a Factor in History*, Creighton Lecture, 1915) distinguishes, as a less advanced stage of social progress, from the sentiment of nationality. He says: "By the Tribal instinct I mean that natural tendency which draws men towards those who resemble themselves in aspect, in speech and in customs—especially religious customs.... They often deemed themselves to be blood relatives sprung from a common ancestor." Anyone who reflects on the tenacious vitality of the Jewish nation, knit together by a common language and stock and a common Law of Jehovah, though lacking all bonds of country and home, will agree that this definition of Tribal Instinct applies most accurately to their case, and that in them "a strong national passion is visible." It is no wonder that their aloofness and their strange customs made them seem to the Romans a "*sceleratissima gens*" (Seneca in Aug. *Civ. Dei*, iv. 34), holding a "*barbara superstitio*" (Cic. *pro Flacco*, 28), filled with "*odium generis humani*," who taught their proselytes "*contemnere deos, exuere patriam, parentes liberos fratres uilia habere*" (Tac. *Hist.* v. 5). Circumstances were partly answerable for this.

When the Israelites came as a nomad horde out of Egypt and dispossessed with inferior numbers the kindred Canaanite tribes, they could only (or so their greatest teachers thought) preserve their worship of Yahweh by avoiding all close intercourse with their neighbours. All through the rule of the Judges and the reigns of the Kings, intermarriage with strangers was forbidden, and a compromise with native cults was considered worthy of death (see especially the history of Elijah); and gradually this loyalty to the God of Israel degenerated into a belief "that Israel's God was bound by a tie which could not be severed to protect the people which worshipped Him" (Cheyne's *Two Religions of Israel*, p. 15). This was the teaching of the "lying prophets" (1 Kings xxii. 22, 23; Jer. xxvii. 9, 10), in other words of the same nationalist or patriotic party that punished Jeremiah as a traitor for advising submission to Babylon, and it is against this spirit that Amos and the higher prophets protest with so much fervour. Lord Bryce truly says: "The national sentiment of Israel was religious rather than racial," and it was as sons of Yahweh even more than of Abraham that they despised their neighbours and were arrogantly confident in a predestined supremacy. Yet from the secular point of view, it has been said by Kirsopp Lake (*Stewardship of Faith*) that "one of the most important sides of the story of the Jews is a chapter in the history of nationalism," i.e. in the struggle of great empires against small nations. We must note that it was when the empires of the East were beginning to threaten the Israelites, and they in their turn were drawing the robe of national and religious complacency tighter round them, that Amos dared to denounce the "transgressions" of

Israel as even more heinous than those of the heathen (i. 3, ii. 6 and iii. 2), and to proclaim that nationalism was equally precious in all nations under heaven (ix. 7). W. Temple (*The Church and the Nation*, p. 45) points out that at first in the Old Testament everything was "concentrated on the primary object of fashioning Israel into a nation," but that the turning-point comes with Amos' teaching that "all nations stand on an equal footing before the Judgment Seat of God." We find the same breadth of view in Isaiah xix. 23-25, where Egypt, Assyria and Israel are all to serve God together—while as the national glories were extinguished in the Babylonian captivity, the prophets of the Exile, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and others, turned their minds to a *future* hope for the race and the individual,—a coming Messiah and eternal life. Then came the transference from the Babylonian Empire to the Persian, and the return to the Holy Land. St Augustine in *Ciu. Dei*, xiv. 34, tells in graphic words the rest of the Jewish story—how their hopes of national restoration after the repairing of the Temple (due to a misunderstanding of Haggai ii. 6-9) were shattered by the invasion of Alexander the Great, who actually sacrificed in the Sacred House—how the kings first of Egypt and then of Syria ruled over the land, leading many of the Jews captive; how Judas Maccabeus "restored the Temple to the ancient dignity," and his brother Jonathan founded a new high-priestly dynasty, that of the Asmoneans; how Aristobulus, his great-nephew, "did assume a diadem and became both king and priest"; how the Romans in the next generation were called in by Hyrcanus against his brother, the second Aristobulus, and how "Pompey the great general of Rome's forces

brought his powers into Judaea, took Jerusalem...and, as a profaner entered the *sanctum sanctorum*." "Here," the old writer concludes, "began the Jews to be the Romans' tributaries....And within a few years after, Herod an alien was made their Governor," thus fulfilling in Augustine's eyes Gen. xlix. 10, for "the Jews had never been without a prince of their blood until Herod's time, who was their first alien king." "Now then was the time of Shiloh come; now was the New Testament to be promulgated."

The subsequent history of the Jewish nation is soon told. After the death of Herod the Great (4 B.C.) his sons, Archelaus and Antipas, respectively received from Augustus (in spite of the Jews' pleading for direct Roman government) Judaea with Samaria and Galilee with Peraea. In 6 A.D. Archelaus was deposed, and Judaea obtained as her ruler the coveted equestrian procurator, who was more or less subject to the Governor of Syria. These procurators proved, as we have seen, harsh and unsympathetic in their administration. In any case also, the more ardent Jewish patriots would have felt the payment of tribute to a heathen ruler incompatible with their cherished ideas of theocracy and sovereignty over all nations: hence the opposition to the census (Acts v. 37). In the days of Herod the Great, the taxes were collected for his use, but when Judaea became an imperial province they were paid into the *fiscus*, and the Jewish *publicani* were hated not only as grasping but as unpatriotic. For three short years, Herod Agrippa I restored the semblance of Jewish independence, having received from Claudius in 41 A.D. all the dominions of his grandfather Herod the Great. On his death in 44, Judaea became again a part

of a Roman province, and the last series of procurators were worse than the first. It would seem as if the sending of the freedman Festus as Governor (52-60 A.D.) was a deliberate insult to the Jews, and more and more the nationalist spirit rose and swelled. Riots, largely due to misguided Messianic hopes, were very frequent in Judaea and more so in Galilee, and though many Zealots were crucified as "robbers," they were succeeded by the Sicarii, an even more reckless and dangerous band. Finally came the procurator Florus, last and worst of his cruel and venal kind, and with him the fall of Jerusalem, changing for ever the destinies not only of Judaism but of Christianity. On the one hand, the Christians learnt once and for all the lesson taught by their Master to the Samaritan woman, that the Father was to be worshipped not in Jerusalem only, but everywhere, and by all nations, so that the judaizing party in the Church received its death-blow. On the other hand, the Jews as a nation shook off such influence as Hellenism had had on them, abjured all idea of the brotherhood of man, and turned for comfort to the strictest observance of the Torah and its outgrowth, the Talmud. The Sanhedrin disappeared and the Sadducees with it; all that was left was rigidly exclusive Pharisaic Judaism, clinging desperately to the Messianic hope.

This sketch has taken us almost beyond our proper boundaries, and yet it is the writings of Jews in the Christian era—Philo, Josephus, the authors of the later Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha and the compilers of the Talmud—which enable us to reconstruct for ourselves a picture of Jewish life in the time of Our Lord and His apostles. When Christ was born, Herod the Great, though

Idumaeen by race and utterly pagan in spirit, was still nominally a Jewish king. By the time the Public Ministry began, Judaea was under a Roman procurator, but the Sanhedrin still held sway. St Paul's first trial at Rome (Acts xxviii.) transports us to the reign of Nero, with Seneca still alive to teach his master tolerance for a sect of the Jewish religion—before the burning of Rome had brought Christians under suspicion as law-breakers, and before their abstention from common worship and festivals had come to seem anti-social. Years pass on, and finally the Book of Revelation carries us right away from the Jews and the Law, and is concerned only with Rome, "drunken with the blood of the saints" (xvii. 6). As regards the Jewish nation, the New Testament might almost stand for a Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*, and it is at just such crises that National Sentiment and Patriotism come most to the fore.

In any careful study of the attitude of the Jews of New Testament times to other nations, we must not forget the great and distinguishing feature of later Jewish teaching, the Messianic hope and the Coming of the Kingdom. Under an alien king and distant overlords, Judaea as a sovereign state, whether monarchy, theocracy or aristocracy, had, in the eyes of her most faithful subjects, ceased to exist. All round her were heathen cities, whether Syrian as Tyre and Sidon, or Roman colonies as Caesarea, or Greek communities as those of Decapolis, with their seductive Hellenic culture and luxury. Even in Jerusalem itself the hellenizing Herod had built a theatre and instituted games, while foreign mercenaries guarded his person. East of the Sea of Tiberias, there were nomads always ready to encroach on the soil of

Palestine; south-east, there were the Idumaeans, forcibly converted to Judaism by John Hyrcanus, and beyond them the Arabians, also nominal worshippers of Jehovah. Almost at the doors of Jerusalem lay Samaria, renamed Sebaste, with its mixed population, hated by the Jews and returning the hatred (Ezra iv. and Neh. iv.), and its temple built to Augustus by Herod, the professing Jew. From the south-west, the insidious Egyptian and Greek influences of Alexandria filtered into the land, a fact easily appreciated from Philo's statement that there were in his day a million Jews of the Dispersion in Egypt alone. From the far East the Babylonian Jews came up to worship at Jerusalem, bringing with them some at least of the notions of Chaldaea and Persia, while from farther still there had appeared in Asia Minor and Palestine since the days of Herod the Great the dreaded Parthian savages. And behind all the rest, as a stubborn fact to be ignored but never forgotten, there stood the mighty power of Rome. Can we wonder that, "set in the midst of so many and great dangers" to their spiritual life, the Jews strove with might and main to erect round themselves a wall of national exclusiveness, and dreamt of a glorious future as compensation for present woes?

In the early days of the Diadochi, the Chasidim ("pious") were a minority in Judaea, till the insults of Antiochus Epiphanes roused the whole people to rabid fanaticism. The first Asmonean rulers themselves belonged to these Chasidim, forerunners of the Pharisees ("separated"), but their political schemes drew them nearer to the Sadducees, whose interests were as essentially mundane as those of the opposite sect were essentially religious.

The third Jewish sect mentioned by Josephus, the Essenes, were communists and mystics and need not concern us here.

John Hyrcanus (135-105 B.C.) joined the Sadducean sect, and his son, Alexander Jannaeus, extended the Jewish dominions; there is an obvious connection between these two facts. In the long run, however, Pharisaism triumphed. It was patronised by Herod the Great, who deliberately insulted the Sadducees, proud of descent from Zadok, by choosing all his high priests but one from non-Palestinian Jews, and above all it was favoured by the people. By a strange transformation, this sect, to which foreign dominion was not only immaterial, as long as Jehovah might be worshipped, but actually a heaven-sent judgment, much as Cyrus was a heaven-sent deliverer, gave birth to the Zealots (defined by Josephus as "zealous in the worst actions," *War*, iv. 13) who regarded the expulsion of foreign rulers as the sacred duty of every God-fearing Jew—the shortest way to bring about fulfilment of the Messianic hope. The last act of Herod the Great was to burn to death the nationalist Rabbis who had taken down off the Temple gate a hated golden eagle, and the rebellion which this started was not stamped out till Varus, the Governor of Syria, had sold numberless Galilaeans as slaves and crucified 2000 Jews. In other places, tumults were not infrequent. In 38 A.D. the Jews in Alexandria were severely handled by the Governor Flaccus for having refused to worship the Emperor. Claudius, as we know, banished the Jews from Rome (Acts xviii. 2; Suet. *Claud.* 25), and while St Paul was at Caesarea on the way to Rome, a riot over citizen rights occurred there between the Jewish and the Syrian

inhabitants, and was decided by Nero in favour of the latter. Herod Agrippa II in his kingdom of the North might keep his power by unconditional submission to Rome, but in Judaea and above all in Galilee, the establishment of Messiah's kingdom on earth became the consuming desire of every patriot. Even the Sadducees, essentially phil-Hellene and worldly, had to follow the Pharisees in their views, or the "multitude would not tolerate them" (Jos. *Ant.* XVIII. 1. 4 and cf. John xi. 47-50). And, as always happens, the darker the political outlook grew, the more the extreme party became predominant, till they dragged the nation into final ruin.

What, then, did a religious Jew, and especially the Pharisee, mean by the Messianic hope, that hope which, in St Paul's eyes, was no less vivid for Christian than for Jew (Acts xxvi. 6, 7 and xxviii. 20)? The subject is too enormous for more than the most cursory sketch, chiefly based on R. H. Charles' *Religious Development between the Old and New Testaments*. Whereas Prophecy had treated of the destiny of Israel as a *nation*, Apocalyptic, fostered by national calamity, concerned itself with future blessedness for the *individual*. Prophecy had told of a final cataclysm and of the Messiah coming to reign for ever on the present earth, with every circumstance of material splendour and happiness, after either seventy years, as in the teaching of Jeremiah, or seventy weeks of years, according to Daniel, or seventy reigns of seventy angelic patrons, as in Enoch. Apocalyptic, by 100 B.C., had learned to regard this world as irreclaimably bad, and to hope for a spiritual kingdom. This hope took various forms. Sometimes men dreamed of a temporary Messianic kingdom on a transformed earth, followed by

the Judgment; sometimes their thoughts went straight to a spiritual reign and a heavenly Jerusalem. In any case, whether the kingdom included all nations, as the wider-minded prophets and pseudepigraphists maintained (Messiah is the "light of the Gentiles" in Isaiah xlix. 6 and in 1 Enoch xlviii. 4), or ended with Judaea, it certainly began there. As Edersheim puts it, in his *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, Vol. I. p. 4, "History, patriotism, religion and hope alike pointed to Jerusalem and the Temple as the centre of Israel's unity," and Philo could truly assert (*in Flaccum*, 971) that, wherever sojourning, the Jews had but one metropolis. (See the peculiar feeling about Jerusalem in Ps. cxxxvii., John ii. 19, iv. 20.) The more the Jews of the Dispersion, who formed the vast majority, were exposed to Greek influences, the more the Palestinian Jews paraded the strictest Hebrew orthodoxy, laying the greatest stress on purity of descent, and even considering the Septuagint, the People's Bible, though translated by Rabbis from Jerusalem, as no less disastrous to Israel than the Golden Calf (end of Vol. ix. of *Babylonian Talmud*). All Jews, says Edersheim, believed in the "absolute superiority of the Jew as such," and all hoped for the restoration of Israel's dominion (sometimes with a Messiah as Prince, sometimes as a direct theocracy) and the return of all the "Dispersed." Israel's ideal of unity rested on the Law, and her ideal of independence on the Messianic hope. "To the orthodox Jew" (Edersheim, I. 84) "the mental and spiritual horizon was bounded by Palestine," and if the Gentiles were not to be cast with Satan into Gehenna, as Yalkut teaches, or set to gaze with shame and envy at the Messianic feast, according to the Rabbinical explanation of Psalm xxiii. 5,

they would attain their salvation by God's favour, not by right, as would the Jews. This attitude of mind necessarily produced sublime contempt, even hatred, for these same inferior Gentiles. The Talmudic Tractate Mekhilta stands perhaps alone in its savage injunction: "The best among the Gentiles, kill; the best among serpents, crush its head." But the existence of Jewish ἀμικξία and bitterness towards outside nations would seem to be proved by the fact that Edersheim expends many words in asserting it, while Josephus *against Apion*, and, in our own days, Montefiore in his *Jowett Lectures* and Rodkinson in his *History of the Talmud*, do the same in denying it, the last-named admitting however that the Babylonian Talmud has occasional uncharitable utterances against non-Jews, "due to momentary indignation." Passages from the Mishna and Gemara may doubtless be quoted on both sides, but for the purposes of our present study, it is enough to note that at the beginning of the Christian era the Jews had no dealings with the Samaritans (their kinsmen by blood, at least in great measure, and doing honour to the same God and the same Pentateuch) and that it needed a special revelation to make St Peter go into the house even of a God-fearing Gentile. In such an atmosphere, as Edersheim points out, no high spiritual aspirations were fostered. "All that Israel needed: 'study of the law and good works,' lay within the reach of everyone; and all that Israel hoped for was national restoration. Everything else was but means to these ends; the Messiah Himself only the grand instrument in attaining them" (I. 164). It makes us understand why Our Lord so sternly preached that without conversion and a becoming as little children, no Jew

could enter the Kingdom of which he felt so absolutely secure.

We have now given a brief and inadequate sketch of the background against which the drama of the New Testament story is played. Perhaps it may be allowable to quote an unpublished letter from a Cambridge scholar. "Try to picture to yourself a parallel case. Suppose a little nation somewhere in the Anglo-Indian Empire, with a puppet prince of alien blood, kept in possession by a sort of British military resident, whose relation to the prince is rather that of Sirdar to Khedive; picture a temple with worldly ecclesiastics, having vested interests dominant—a dean and chapter managing the precincts to make their own profits, a number of pious and narrow high-churchmen and a few mystics, and around all the mob, nationalist, swayed to and fro by the Zealot-party or Sinn Feiners.... Perhaps it may in a confused way give you the atmosphere at Jerusalem when Christ came."

Against this background let us try to draw in the principal figures—Jews by birth and Christians by re-birth. But first we must try reverently to estimate the attitude towards National Sentiment of Our Blessed Lord.

On the very briefest inspection, we cannot fail to perceive that "the purely national elements" which played so large a part in Rabbinic expectation "scarcely entered into the teaching of Jesus about the Kingdom of God" (Edersheim, i. 164). The Kingdom as preached by Him is spiritual (Lu. xvii. 21; Matt. vi. 10) and only won by obedience (Matt. v. 19 and vii. 21), righteousness (Matt. v. 20 and vi. 33) and kindness to others (Matt. xxv. 34 sqq.). It is hard work to enter it (Matt. xi. 12), and needs vigilant toil (Matt. xxv. 1, 14), yet once inside, the subjects find

rest (Matt. xi. 28-30, contr. the Pharisaic bondage, Matt. xxiii. 4). It is for the "little ones" of this life—those with the hearts of children (Matt. xviii. 3 and xix. 14; John iii. 3), the poor in spirit (Matt. v. 3), and the persecuted (Matt. v. 10). The rich are wellnigh excluded (Mark x. 23-25). It is heralded by repentance (Matt. iv. 17), and it brings good news (Matt. iv. 23), and God's forgiveness (Matt. xviii. 27). So it is a pearl of great price (Matt. xiii. 44-46), and its mysteries are the precious possession of Christ's followers (Matt. xiii. 11). With marvellous secret power, it influences the whole life (Matt. xiii. 31-33; Mark iv. 26-29); but, above all, it knows no national restrictions. The Jews were by birth "Children of the Kingdom" (Matt. viii. 12), yet the privileges they slighted may pass on to others (Matt. xiii. 38, 43 and xxi. 43). It is as all-embracing as a great net (Matt. xiii. 47), and is to be proclaimed in all the world (Matt. xxiv. 14, xxvi. 13, xxviii. 19; Lu. xxiv. 47; John iii. 16, vi. 33, x. 16, xii. 32; Acts i. 8).

In order that all material hopes may be destroyed, Christ five times refuses to stand forth as an earthly king (Matt. iv. 8-10; Lu. xix. 11; John vi. 15, xviii. 33-37; Acts i. 6), and tells His disciples to expect no reward in this life (Matt. xix. 27-29 and xx. 20-28). When He speaks of the Son of Man coming in his Kingdom (Matt. xvi. 28) He probably refers either to the Transfiguration or to the fall of Jerusalem, though His Galilaean followers, with their ardent patriotic hopes, doubtless took the words in a literal sense. In this connection we may note the fact that eleven out of the twelve Apostles—all, in fact, but the traitor Judas—seem to have come from Galilee, described by Charles as the "home of the religious seer

and mystic," and by Edersheim as the "home of warm impulsive hearts, of intense nationalism." One was a Zealot; another, Judas the brother of James, if indeed he wrote the letter called by his name, was steeped in the patriotic literature known as Apocalyptic; while James the son of Alphaeus may have given us that interesting epistle which reminds Talmudic students of the teaching of Shammai, greatest of nationalists. The Galilaeans killed by Pilate were probably rebels (Lu. xiii. 1), and it has been pointed out that Barabbas *versus* Jesus was equivalent to Zealotism *versus* Quietism (Lu. xxiii. 19). Thus we may say that Our Lord carefully selected the most fanatically patriotic Jews, to learn His great lesson of a universal brotherhood, with the God of Israel for Father.

For no dispassionate reader can deny that this universal brotherhood, this breaking down of the middle wall of partition, is one of the key-notes of Christ's message. Whether Patriotism is in itself good or bad, its advocates are bound to admit that it is never expressly inculcated by Christ; nay, more, as far as its contemporary form went, is constantly discouraged. W. Temple (*op. cit.*) says: "Patriotism is particular; religion ought to be universal."... "The instinct of nationality was never christened at all."... "The church is essentially not accidentally international." Zangwill points out that the universalism of Christianity clashed peculiarly with European tribalism. Westcott (*Social Aspects of Christianity*) advocates the "one experiment of Christian statesmanship which has not yet been tried, the policy of national brotherhood." James Martineau (*National Duties*) almost treats "the Universality of the Gospel"

as a weakness, and finally Loisy (*The War and Religion*) sums up the matter in two short sentences: "The Gospel knows nothing of Patriotism....The Gospel of Jesus implies the non-existence of nationality; it effaces it."

This has been partly shown in considering Christ's teaching about the Kingdom. It may be further studied in connection with His attitude:

- (1) To Himself as Messiah;
- (2) To His compatriots and the Law;
- (3) To the Gentiles.

(1) It is remarkable that Christ during His public ministry never calls Himself the Messiah, at least in the Synoptic Gospels. The confession of St Peter is to be kept strictly private (Matt. xvi. 13-20). Critics have even supposed that it was his Master's Messianic hopes which Judas "betrayed," so that at His trial before Caiaphas further concealment was useless (Matt. xxvi. 63, 64). St John's account is, of course, very different (John iv. 25, 26, vi. 69, vii. 26-28, ix. 22, x. 24-26), and in any case the secret was to be revealed after Christ's death.

On the other hand, Christ deliberately fulfilled the generally accepted Messianic prophecy of Zech. ix. 9—an anomaly which is somewhat hard to explain, though in Hastings' *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels* ("Nationality") this act is described as "the expression of His own patriotic consciousness." He allowed Himself to be hailed as Son of David by the many (Matt. ix. 27, xx. 30, xxi. 15) and as Son of God by the few (Matt. xvi. 16; John i. 49, xi. 27, and cf. the heavenly voices at the Baptism and Transfiguration). But His usual name for Himself is Son of Man, which probably merely bears its

Aramaic meaning of "human being" (Mark ii. 10, 28). This subject is discussed at some length in Hastings' *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*. In the first passage where the term appears (Dan. vii. 13) the contrast is clearly between "humanity" and the "four great beasts," representing heathen empires, and the later expansion of this chapter in 1 Enoch xlvi. does not give adequate ground for taking the title as equivalent to "Messiah." The fact that Christ's followers never use it but once after His Ascension (Acts vii. 56) seems to point in the same direction; it had no superhuman connotation and in using it Christ made no Messianic claim. Indeed, it was not as the King-Messiah that He wished His disciples to follow Him on this earth. At the last days He would come again in glory, fulfilling all the nation's hopes in an even grander way than they dreamed (Matt. xix. 28, xxiv. 30, xxv. 31, xxvi. 64), but now was His time of humiliation and suffering and death (Matt. xvi. 21, xx. 17-19 and xxvi. 54; Lu. xvii. 25, xxiv. 26, 46). He refused to appear before the multitude as the conventional Messiah borne by angels (Matt. iv. 5-7). He would not give them signs from Heaven (Matt. xvi. 1-4; John vii. 3 and xiv. 22), for preaching, not miracle-working, is His proper task (Mark i. 38; cf. Lu. ix. 2, 11), and even in the moment of His Transfiguration His thoughts dwelt on the "decease which He should accomplish at Jerusalem" (Lu. ix. 31). His disciples, much as they humanly shrank from such an ending to their hopes (Matt. xvi. 22, 23; Lu. ix. 45 and xviii. 34), came to feel that He was thus the prototype of the Suffering Servant and God-sent Healer of 'Isaiah liii. and lxi.—neither of which chapters received a Messianic application from the Jews themselves. Just as Christ

wished to change and elevate men's views of the Kingdom of God, so did He transform their conception of the Messiah from a national earthly King to the spiritual ruler of "as many as received Him."

(2) About Our Lord's affection for His country there can be no doubt. He wept over her neglected chances (Matt. xxiii. 37; Lu. xix. 41-44); He had all a patriot's admiration for the great and beautiful buildings whose downfall He foresaw (Matt. xxiii. 17; Mark xiii. 1, 2; John ii. 16, 17), and even in His own agony He mourned for His native land (Lu. xxiii. 28-30). In His personal life He was a devout Jew, frequenting the synagogue, attending the feasts at Jerusalem, paying the Temple tribute. The worldliness and scepticism of the Sadducean priests was to Him no reason for refusing attendance at the services they conducted. As an infant He was circumcised and presented in the Temple (cf. Gal. iv. 4); as a man He enjoined on the healed leper to show himself to the priest and offer the gift which Moses commanded (Matt. viii. 4). He set great store by the Law (Matt. v. 17, 18); considering it a perfectly adequate guide to conduct (Matt. xix. 17; Lu. x. 25-28, xvi. 29; John v. 46). Even the ordinances of the Pharisees were to be obeyed (Matt. xxiii. 3) except when they made the commandment of God of none effect by their tradition (Matt. xv. 6). Only where the Law of Moses seemed to Him narrow or unloving did He point to anything higher (Matt. v. 21-48, xix. 3-9; Lu. xx. 27-36; John viii. 3-11). His familiarity with the Old Testament is shown at the Temptation, in His first sermon (Lu. iv.) and throughout His dealings with His people (e.g. Matt. xxi. 13, 16; Lu. xx. 41-44, xxiv. 25-27, 45). He feels emphatically that "salvation

is of the Jews" (Matt. xv. 26; John iv. 22). Yet all this did not save Him from the charge of blasphemy and law-breaking. The Pharisees, all along shocked at His opening His Kingdom to despised "publicans and sinners," began to hate Him when by plucking the corn, restoring the withered hand and healing impotence, dropsy and blindness, He set aside that conventional rigid view of the Sabbath which dated from the time of the Maccabees (1 Macc. ii. 32-38). His neglect of fasts (Matt. ix. 14) and ceremonial washings (Mark vii. 5-23), though He Himself was baptized "to fulfil all righteousness" (Matt. iii. 15), added fuel to the fire, while His refusal to regard burying the dead as a paramount duty was in direct opposition to Rabbinical teaching (Matt. viii. 22). The Pharisees on their side seemed to Him "blind leaders of the blind" (Matt. xv. 14) lost in the darkness of externalism (Matt. xv. 8 and xxiii. 5, 14, 23, 25; Lu. xviii. 11, 12) and exclusiveness (Matt. xxiii. 13)—truly "scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites" (Matt. xxiii. 15). In another quarter the rich Sadducees were hurt in their financial interests by the cleansing of the Temple, a definite interference with the priests' commercial monopoly, and considered by some writers to have been the immediate cause of the Crucifixion. Finally, Christ's attitude to the multitude was no less strikingly un-Jewish. Not only did He consort with the traitor publicans and choose one for an apostle (Matt. ix. 9-11; Lu. xv. 1, 2, xix. 1-9), but Kirsopp Lake (*op. cit.*) would have us see in the Gospels a distinct anti-Zealot polemic. The people wished to make Him a king, and His refusal marks the point when fickle popular favour began to turn against Him. It is patience and submission, not militant patriotism that He praises (Matt. x. 22, 23,

xxiv. 13). However much He loved Jerusalem, He could calmly foretell that she would be "trodden down of the Gentiles" (Lu. xxi. 24), and His command to His followers in the hour of her crisis was "Flee into the mountains" (Matt. xxiv. 16). Every act and word of Christ in Holy Week, from His acceptance of Roman rule in the matter of the Imperial tribute (Matt. xxii. 15-22) to His abjuring even celestial violence in His own defence (Matt. xxvi. 53, 54), must have seemed to the Jewish people a wilful shattering of their most sacred hopes. Julia Wedgwood (*Message of Israel*) truly says: "We do not enough realise the utterly unpatriotic aspect which the attitude of Christ must have taken in the eyes of His countrymen." It was essentially hurt religious and racial pride which led them to consider Him an incarnation of Satan (Matt. xii. 24; John viii. 48), and finally to trump up before the Romans the charges of sedition and blasphemy (Lu. xxiii. 2-5; John xix. 7, 19-22). If He would not behave as the Messiah, neither showing signs as a Prophet, nor enforcing the traditions of the Elders as a Priest, nor claiming sovereignty as a King, let Him be put to death for fear of trouble (John xi. 48). As the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels* says: "Though He embodied the hope of Israel and fulfilled the Law of Moses, it was in the name both of the hope which the priests mistook, and of the Law which the Scribes misinterpreted, that Jesus was brought to the cross."

If we turn from the actions of Our Lord to His discourses, we find the same protest against Jewish exclusiveness. The parables of the Wicked Husbandmen (Matt. xxi., and cf. Matt. viii. 12), the Two Sons (Matt. xxi.), the Wedding Guests (Matt. xxii.) deal solely with this

topic, while the Labourers in the Vineyard (Matt. xx.) and the Barren Fig Tree (Lu. xiii.) may be so interpreted. The Jews in their obstinate rejection of the Gospel are unfavourably compared not only with the men of Tyre and Sidon (Matt. xi. 21, 22) and the Queen of Sheba (Matt. xii. 42) but even with the sinful people of Sodom and Gomorrah (Matt. xi. 23, 24) and of Nineveh (Matt. xii. 41). They are not truly children of Abraham (John viii. 39) nor followers of Moses (John v. 46); in the words of Isaiah "This people's heart is waxed gross" (Matt. xiii. 15) and the sentence is pronounced in solemn words: "The kingdom of God shall be taken from you and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof" (Matt. xxi. 43).

(3) This last sentence is a fitting introduction to our third point—Christ's attitude to the Gentiles. We have seen in all His preaching that the door of His Kingdom is open to all, and His first discourse at Nazareth threw down the glove, as it were, to Jewish exclusiveness. God cared about the widow of Sarepta and the Syrian Naaman no less than for His chosen people (Lu. iv. 25–27). Ever after Christ goes out of His way, we may almost say, to reprove the misguided patriotism which thought only Jews acceptable to God. The withholding of the Gospel during His lifetime from Samaritans and Gentiles as a whole (Matt. x. 5, 6) was obviously only a temporary measure, as is proved in Lu. xxiv. 47, Acts i. 8, and the consequent behaviour of the Apostles after Pentecost. Jesus is willing to go into the house of the uncircumcised centurion, and warmly praises the spirit which he shows (Matt. viii. 10). He rewards, after a hesitation not altogether easy to understand, the faith of the Syro-

phenician woman (Matt. xv. 21-28) and He allows Philip and Andrew to bring Greeks to Him (John xii. 22). He goes to the country of the Gergesenes, where the inhabitants kept swine (Matt. viii. 28-34), and He is to be found in the Syrian "coasts of Tyre and Sidon" (Matt. xv. 21) as well as the Hellenic "coasts" of Caesarea Philippi (Matt. xvi. 13) and Decapolis (Mark vii. 31). It is surely no accident that whereas He answers nothing to the would-be Jew, King Herod (Lu. xxiii. 9), He speaks freely to the Roman Governor (John xviii. 36, 37, xix. 11) and makes allowances for him. We have already seen His respect for Gentile authority (Matt. xxii. 21); the same thing comes out in His warnings to His disciples of what they would suffer from that authority (Lu. xii. 11, xxi. 12). The Gentiles are not to be imitated in their worldly-mindedness (Matt. vi. 32) and their desire for power (Matt. xx. 25), but they are to be courteously treated and "loved" even when enemies (Matt. v. 43-47). The half-breed Samaritans, more obnoxious to the Jew than the real Gentiles (John viii. 48), are to be admitted to Gospel privileges (John iv.), and one of the despised race is chosen as the hero of Christ's most beautiful parable (Lu. x.). When the Samaritans churlishly refuse Him passage through their country, He checks all feelings of animosity in His disciples (Lu. ix. 52-55), and the thankfulness of the Samaritan leper is made to shine out in edifying contrast against the ingratitude of the Jews (Lu. xvii. 16). Even if it were possible to see with G. B. Shaw (*Preface to Androcles*) a "Chauvinist Jew" in the Christ of St Matthew's Gospel, there is certainly the very reverse of such a spirit in the Christ portrayed for us by St Luke and St John. It hardly needs St Paul's

magnificent words to make us realise that in Christ "there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female" (Gal. iii. 28). The middle wall of partition is for ever broken down.

Such, then, was the attitude of Our Blessed Lord towards National Sentiment: the Gospel of Jesus, as Loisy says, effaces Nationality. It now remains to be seen how far His disciples followed in His steps.

(1) During their Master's lifetime, the twelve Apostles seem to have grasped this great tenet of Christianity as little as they did all the rest. They see in Jesus a Jewish Messiah who will restore a temporal kingdom and give them earthly rewards. They fail to understand His allusions to shame and death. They treat the Syro-phenician mother as a mere nuisance, more easily sent away if relieved first (Matt. xv. 23), and they watch in horrified silence Christ's treatment of the woman of Samaria. It is only after the coming of the Holy Spirit that the idea of a universal Kingdom of God is unfolded to them by slow degrees. St Matthew writes his Gospel as a Jew for Jews, beginning it with a genealogy of Christ's descent from Abraham. Christ is to him above all things the fulfiller of prophecy, a claim which he makes for Him no less than fourteen times (i. 23, ii. 5-6, 15, 18, 23, iii. 3, iv. 14, viii. 17, ix. 13, xii. 17-21, xxi. 5, xxvi. 56, xxvii. 9, 35), and it is the "God of Israel" Whom Christ's mighty works lead people to glorify (Matt. xv. 31). Even St Peter, destined afterwards to baptise the first uncircumcised convert, shows no breadth of view, but is as Jewish and material as the others in his Messianic hopes (Matt. xvi. 22, xix. 27; Mark i. 36-38), so that he has to ask Christ "privately" about anything so

unheard of as the fall of Jerusalem (Mark xiii. 3). It may even be remarked that St Mark, under St Peter's tuition, writes almost affectionately of Herod Antipas, who, with all his vices, might seem to a Jewish patriot the representative of Mariamne and the Asmonean house (Mark vi. 20, 26). Yet this hot-headed Galilaean, with his provincial dialect (Mark xiv. 70) and racial impulsiveness (Matt. xiv. 28; Mark xiv. 31; John xiii. 37), was chosen by Christ to bear the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven and to be the Christian pioneer in preaching the Gospel, not only to the Jews and their children but to "all that are afar off" (Acts ii. 39). To St John with his Greek culture (how attained we need not here consider) Christ is the Universal Light (i. 9, viii. 12) and Saviour (John i. 29, iii. 16, xii. 32). He was rejected by the Jews, "His own" (i. 11, xii. 37-41, cf. viii. 42), though He fulfilled their scriptures (xix. 28, 36, 37); but His kingdom is not of this world (xviii. 36) and has no limits of race (x. 16). In Catholic spirit, the writer of the fourth Gospel stands far above the other evangelists, and is akin to if not identical with the mystical seer of the Book of Revelation, who saw the chosen thousands of Israel closely followed by the "great multitude which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues" (Rev. vii. 9).

(2) From the Gospels we pass to the Acts, where the events of the second chapter mark a new era in Christian thought. It is significant that the Universal Gospel preached by St Peter to "Jews, devout men out of every nation under heaven" (Acts ii. 5) should be reinforced in his teaching by an appeal to Joel—the prophet who united (as Charles points out) the legalistic Pharisaism

which developed into modern Judaism, and the apocalyptic Pharisaism which was the forerunner of Christianity. Joel urges "fasts" and "a solemn assembly," yet he foresees that Yahweh will pour out His spirit "upon all flesh" (ii. 15, 28). The gradual expansion of this thought is the theme of the Acts, and the writer was peculiarly fitted for his task. Himself a Greek of Macedonia (then the leading Greek country) probably from Philippi, with the "local feeling" that Ramsay (*op. cit.*) tells us was "the strength and weakness of all Greeks," Luke wrote for a converted Roman official, described like Felix (Acts xxiii. 26) and Festus (Acts xxvi. 25) as *κράτιστος* (Lu. i. 3), whose assumed name of Theophilus perhaps shows that it was already inexpedient for Romans in high places to profess Christianity. In his Gospel he gives many proofs of his non-Jewish proclivities. The quotation from Isaiah about John the Baptist is extended to include the verse "and all flesh shall see the salvation of God" (Lu. iii. 6), and Christ is proclaimed to be not only the Glory of Israel but "a light to lighten the Gentiles" (ii. 32). His Circumcision, Presentation and First Passover, passed over as matters of course by the Jewish Matthew, are narrated in full by St Luke, who also alone tells of the Roman census (ii. 1, 2) and carefully enumerates the rulers of the Holy Land (iii. 1). He alone gives us the universalist sermon at Nazareth, mentions the generosity of the Roman centurion at Capernaum (vii. 4, 5) and of the despised publican Zacchaeus at Jericho (xix. 1-8), and displays special interest in the Samaritans (ix. 52-56, x. 33 sqq., xvii. 11 sqq.). Indeed, a sentence in the last chapter of his Gospel (xxiv. 27), "That repentance and remission of sins should be preached

in His name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem," might be said to be the text or motto of the Acts. First, we have the good news told to the Jews of the Dispersion, with synagogues scattered everywhere from Parthia to Cyrene and from Arabia to Rome (Acts ii. 9-11 and vi. 9). Then, for their special needs, deacons are appointed (ch. vi.), of whom six are Greek-speaking Jews ('Ελληνισταί, Grecians) and one is a Greek proselyte, i.e. by birth a "Έλλην or Greek. The leader of the seven, St Stephen, is said by Lightfoot to have sounded the death-knell of Mosaic ordinances and temple worship. Next comes the mission to the Samaritans (ch. viii.) begun by Philip the Deacon and completed by Peter and John, and as a kind of sequel, the charming story of Philip baptizing the Ethiopian eunuch. So far the Gospel had only been taken to Jews, or half-Jews, or proselytes of the Covenant, but the calling of the Gentiles had been revealed to Ananias as the future work of Saul the Persecutor (Acts ix. 15). The first step, however, was taken not by St Paul but by St Peter, who welcomed as a convert the uncircumcised Cornelius, and announced as God's revelation to himself that "In every nation he that feareth Him and worketh righteousness is accepted with Him" (Acts x. 35). When we meet Gentiles again it is in the synagogue of Antioch in Pisidia (xiii. 42) and to them St Paul turns when the Jews reject his message (xiii. 46); from now onwards, St Paul is the acknowledged Apostle of the Gentiles (Acts xiv. 27, xv. 3, etc.) and champions their claims to Christian freedom (Acts xv. and Gal. ii.). Broad-minded counsels prevail at the Council of Jerusalem, and the Gentile converts are excused by the Jewish leaders of the Church from obligatory circumcision; only idolatry and

impurity are forbidden, and for purposes of easy intercourse with Jews they are told to eat *kosher* meat. Finally, the story of the Acts shows Paul confronted with definitely Pagan Gentiles, who are drawn by Luke with minute accuracy—Asiatic and Roman magistrates (of whom the latter are usually more friendly than the former)—the populace of Athens and its learned men, to whom he preaches (as once before at Lystra and once later in Romans i., ii.) a sermon of Natural Religion worthy of a Stoic philosopher—and finally the military representatives of Rome. This, according to Ramsay, completes Luke's scheme. His task was to show, when writing under the hostile rule of Domitian, that Paul's acquittal was a charter of religious liberty; that in Paul's eyes Christianity was destined not to destroy but to save the Roman Empire, and must be thought of, so to speak, in imperial terms; and that Paul, though a "Hebrew *sprung from Hebrews*" (Phil. iii. 5) and a citizen of Tarsus, a "no mean" Greco-Asiatic city (Acts xxi. 39), yet attached supreme importance to being a Roman and freeborn (Acts xvi. 37, xxii. 27, 28). To Bernard Shaw (*op. cit.*) St Paul is "more Jewish than the Jews, more Roman than the Romans, proud both ways"; but this twofold pride learnt to become "all things to all men" (1 Cor. ix. 20–22). It was just these different sides of his nature—his unstained record as a pure-bred and orthodox Pharisee (Acts viii. 3, xxii. 3, xxiii. 6, xxiv. 14–18, xxv. 8, xxvi. 4 sqq., xxviii. 17; Rom. ix. 1–5, xi. 1; 2 Cor. xi. 22; Gal. i. 14; Phil. iii. 5; 2 Tim. i. 3), possibly sprung from the Jews settled in Asia Minor by Antiochus IV (175–164 B.C.),—his Greek culture acquired in Tarsus, which Strabo tells us surpassed even Athens and Alexandria in zeal for

philosophy (see Acts xxi. 37),—and his consciousness of membership in a world-wide Empire whose institutions he honoured and in whose laws he constantly shows himself versed (e.g. Gal. iv. 5, 7)—that enabled St Paul (*Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*) to “draw out to the full logical issue the universal implication of the Gospel,” so that “what nationality had hitherto done for religion... humanity was to do henceforth.” In this great task, the dominion of Rome, with its centralised government and easy inter-communication, and with Greek understood everywhere, was an incalculably important agent. It is difficult to put this too strongly. Edersheim, from one point of view, may deplore the fact that “Roman sway had levelled the ancient world and buried its national characteristics,” but Ramsay can with equal truth boast that, following in the wake of Stoic philosophy, it was “the mission of Rome to make the idea of cosmopolitanism a practical reality,” and Lightfoot (*Galatians*) describes the Empire as “a great framework for the spread of the Catholic Church.” So, from the moment when Saul changed his name to Paulus (Acts xiii. 9) and, in Ramsay’s words, “stepped forward as a citizen of the Roman Empire,” he seems to have aimed at nothing less than making Christianity the Imperial Religion. Thus he is eager to go to Spain, as the great seat of Latin civilization in the West (Rom. xv. 24, 28). Roman policy had indeed much in common with Christianity. Both favoured the Greek language—the Romans by studying it at home and allowing it abroad, and the Christians by expecting all their converts to read the Scriptures in Greek. At Rome, for 250 years, the Christians, as we tell from inscriptions, were a Greek-speaking community, while

Latin down to the Late Empire was obligatory only in official matters (John xix. 20). Both fostered Imperial Patriotism and obliterated tribal distinctions, the one by the cult of the Emperors (an Egyptian and Asiatic phase of religion shrewdly adopted by Augustus), the other by a Catholic Church. Both set their faces against the low morality of Asiatic nature worship, and while Roman poets deplored the influx of Eastern vices into Rome, Tatian the Christian apologist could claim that Christianity supplied to the Empire the desired moral law for all. To both, Universal Citizenship, Equality of rights for men, and a Universal Religion, were objects of aspiration, and in consequence, till persecution began, Christian teachers all agreed in placing the Roman Government in a favourable light (contrast Rom. xiii. and 1 Pet. ii. with Rev. xvii.). All political agitation is discouraged by St Paul, as putting the ephemeral in the place of the eternal (Phil. iii. 20; 1 Th. iv. 11, v. 14; 2 Th. iii. 6, 11; 1 Tim. ii. 2; Tit. iii. 1, 2). Even the Emperor-cult, withdrawal from which finally brought the Christians into trouble as sacrilegious and unsociable—Roman subjects who “looked to a non-Roman unity” (Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire*)—was not without its uses in the spread of Christianity. The Roman provinces, organised on a politico-religious basis for the purposes of the cult, became to St Paul and his biographer appropriate districts of mission work. Three of the Seven Churches of Revelation—Ephesus, Smyrna and Pergamos—were in cities known as *νεωκόροι*, i.e. Keepers of an Imperial Temple erected by the *κοινόν* or Provincial Council, and of these the first was founded by St Paul in the very seat of Roman Government. Where Rome had established one

unifying religion, it was less difficult to replace it by another.

If this universal religion begins in the Acts with St Peter, it is, as we have seen above, St Paul who carries it forward. As a Jew he had possibly been a member of the Sanhedrin (Acts viii. 1, xxii. 20), with its power over synagogues in distant cities (Acts ix. 2, xxii. 5). As a Christian he preached by preference to Jews first (Acts xiii. 46, xviii. 5, 6, xxviii. 25-28; Rom. ii. 9, 10), but it was as missionary to the Gentiles that he held his special position in the Church (Acts xiii. 47, xiv. 27, xv. 3, 12, xxi. 19, xxii. 21, xxvi. 17-23; Rom. xi. 13, xv. 9-19; Gal. i. 16 and ch. ii.; Eph. iii.; Col. i. 27; 1 Tim. ii. 7; 2 Tim. i. 11). He himself kept the feasts, took Jewish vows and attended services in synagogues and the Temple, quoted the Hebrew Scriptures to all his hearers and readers, and on one occasion had a half-Jewish disciple (Timothy) circumcised "because of the Jews which were in those quarters" (Acts xvi. 1-3). Yet in all his Epistles, especially those to the Galatians and Romans, he inveighs with fervour (Rom. ii. 28, 29) against the Jewish idea that God was bound to their nation, "a perpetual privilege on the part of one race, however they might behave" (Gore, *Romans*), and never ceases to assert that, for a Gentile convert, circumcision, which came into operation later than the promise to Abraham (Rom. iv.; Gal. iii.) is unnecessary—indeed, positively hurtful, as showing want of faith in the New Covenant (1 Cor. vii. 19; Gal. v. 2-6, vi. 15; Phil. iii. 2, 3; Col. ii. 11, iii. 11, and see Gal. ii. 3). The Law, however holy in itself (Rom. vii. 12; 1 Tim. i. 8), is but a *παιδαγωγός* to bring men to Christ (Gal. iii. 24, 25); it

consists of "weak and beggarly elements" (Gal. iv. 9); it is "weak through the flesh" (Rom. viii. 3) and those who remain content with it are "blind" (Rom. xi. 25; 2 Cor. iii. 14, 15). After this, it is hardly surprising that even in St Paul's earliest Epistles the hostility of the Jews to his teaching is patent (1 Th. ii. 14-16) and is restrained only by the Roman Empire (2 Th. ii. 7, cf. also 2 Cor. xi. 24, 26). The Jews of Jerusalem despised even the Jews of Asia Minor as corrupt and hellenized; how much more then these uncircumcised Gentiles whom Paul favoured (Acts xxii. 21, 22; Gal. v. 11)! But to St Paul these Gentiles were beloved children, and though, as a patriotic Jew, he holds the Church of Jerusalem to be the Mother Church, entitled to honour and support from others (1 Cor. xvi. 1-3; 2 Cor. ix.) while he himself yearns over his people, ready to purchase their salvation even by his own perdition (Rom. ix. 3), he clearly realises that the Gentiles are the Church of the future, to which indeed they had given its name (Acts xi. 26). The Jewish nation, as the "Israel of God," had had great and solemn privileges (Rom. iii. 1, 2, ix. 4), unmerited, as their wisest men had felt (Deut. xxvi.; Ezek. xvi.; Amos ix. 7-10); yet these had only served to make the Cross a "stumbling-block" to their possessors (1 Cor. i. 22, 23). At the same time, culture had led the Greeks to view that same Cross as "foolishness,"—a bitter indictment of current learning and philosophy due doubtless in some measure to St Paul's disappointing experiences at Athens. God had concluded them all, Jew and Gentile alike, "in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all" (Rom. xi. 32; cf. Rom. v.; 2 Cor. v. 15; 1 Tim. ii. 4; Tit. ii. 11). And so to St Paul, as to his Master, days and meats seemed minor matters

(Rom. xiv.; 1 Cor. viii., x.; Gal. iv. 10; Col. ii. 16; 1 Tim. iv. 3) in view of the great revelation of Christianity—the novel and universal duty of loving all men, an idea so new that it required a new word, ἀγάπη, to embody it. “The Kingdom of God is not meat and drink but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost” (Rom. xiv. 17), and God is not “the God of the Jews only,” but “of the Gentiles also,” so that we are “all one in Christ Jesus” (Rom. iii. 29, x. 12; 1 Cor. xii. 13; Gal. iii. 28; Eph. ii. 14, iv. 4–6; Col. i. 12–23, iii. 11). It is indeed a strange irony that this devout Jew, this peace-loving citizen of the Roman Empire, should have been accused, like his Lord before him, of political rebellion and sedition (Acts xvi. 21, xvii. 7, xxiv. 5), and of religious apostasy and sacrilege (Acts xviii. 13, xxi. 21, 28, xxiv. 6). Truly could he say that the Jews “both killed the Lord Jesus and their own prophets and have persecuted us, and they please not God and are contrary to all men, forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles that they might be saved” (1 Th. ii. 15, 16). Yet even St Paul could hardly realise the debt owed by Christianity to those Gentile converts who ultimately, as Kirsopp Lake says, “made Christ the centre of a cult.” The Jewish Messiah had never been considered as divine, and the prerogatives of forgiving and judging were, even in the Messianic kingdom, reserved for Yahweh. St Paul himself never actually calls Jesus Christ God (1 Cor. viii. 6); but the Greek Christians, in using the title κύριος so long applied to divine Emperors (1 Cor. xii. 3), took a great step towards claiming Our Lord’s divinity, and to them in large measure modern Christology owes its origin. They shall bring the glory and honour of the nations into the heavenly Jerusalem,

and to each race is assigned some special contribution of thought. Perfect Christianity, as Gore says, needs the Jew, the Greek, the Roman, the Kelt, the Teuton, and the Slav.

In the New Testament, St Paul's personality is so dominating that after his life and his Epistles are done with, little remains to be studied. That little is, however, of considerable interest. St Peter's Epistles (whether genuine or not) are specially addressed to Gentile Christians (1 Pet. ii. 10, iv. 3), and he writes, if we take the phrase literally, from Babylon (v. 13). Yet he makes an unusual number of allusions to the Old Testament and the Apocrypha (Noah, Lot, Balaam and "the angels that sinned") and speaks of prophecy with peculiar reverence (2 Pet. i. 19-21, iii. 2). His eschatology is purely Jewish. Christ is to come in judgment (1 Pet. iv. 5) and glory (1 Pet. v. 1, 4) and the dissolution of all visible things is to be followed by new heavens and a new earth (2 Pet. iii.). At the same time, in spite of (or because of) their ever-present hope of their Lord's coming, Christians are to be pure and peaceable, submitting "to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake" (1 Pet. ii. 13). This teaching reappears in the Epistle of Jude, which is strikingly like 2 Peter in many ways. The Epistle of James is of such uncertain origin that some, treating ii. 1 as an interpolation, have even ascribed it to an unconverted Jewish author. It is full of scriptural allusions, and dwells on the practical virtues, brotherly love, restraint of speech, and the repression of the "lusts" which lead to war. Even if it comes from the pen of a patriotic follower of the Rabbi Shammai, nothing of National Sentiment can be fairly gleaned from it.

On the other hand, the Epistle to the Hebrews, by an unknown author, runs directly counter to the religious and racial feelings of the Jews. The whole argument is that the sacred Law contained merely "a shadow of good things to come" (x. 1) and that Christianity is the "New Covenant" foretold by Jeremiah (ch. viii.): "The law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did" (vii. 19). So Christ is a better Priest than the High Priest, and a better Sacrifice than the blood of bulls and goats. And the conclusion of all this is, that because Christians have greater privileges than the Jews, therefore they have greater responsibilities (ii. 1-3, x. 26-29, xii. 18-28). The writer takes us away from the earthly Zion and leads us "unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem...to the general assembly and church of the firstborn" (xii. 22, 23), and in the dazzling light of that unity, national differences disappear.

Finally, we come to the writings of John—whether one John or two—three Epistles and the great Christian Apocalypse. In the Epistles there is nothing bearing on our subject except the statement that obedience to God and love to men is the true test of a divine sonship (1 John iii. 10), and that Christ is the propitiation "for the sins of the whole world" (1 John ii. 2). But the Book of Revelation—on the universalist spirit of which we have already dwelt—transports us to a fresh and marked stage in Christian history, very different from even the latest days of St Paul. The animosity of the Jews to the Christians is now insignificant (Rev. ii. 9 and iii. 9), and hostile power has passed into far mightier hands—those of Imperial Rome. The burning of the capital had first laid the Christians under the suspicion of Nero; then

their persistent refusal to worship the Emperor excited the wrath of Domitian, and the storm of persecution burst. So from ii. 13, where the temple of Zeus at Pergamos is described as "Satan's Seat," down to the magnificent tirades against Babylon the Great in chapters xvii. and xviii., Rome stands forth under varied figures as a gigantic, overpowering force of lust and pride and cruelty. It is not till she is fallen that God's servants can cry: "Alleluia, for the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth!" (xix. 6). Little did the writer think that before many years Rome herself would bow to Christ's sway, and that the pretensions of her Empire would be revived in those of the Holy Catholic Church.

We have now at least attempted to examine the whole of the New Testament in the light of National Sentiment and Patriotism. What, then, is the conclusion of the whole matter? Surely that in as far as its writers and actors are Christian, so far are they international rather than national, cosmopolitan rather than patriotic. It may be true, as is claimed by Temple (*op. cit.*), that "the Bible strongly insists on the nation as existing by divine appointment," but this is certainly not true of its Christian half. It may be, as Westcott says (*op. cit.*), that "the nation is an element no less important in the life of the Church than in the life of humanity"; but, if so, it is a truth revealed elsewhere than in the Gospels. Martineau (*op. cit.*) may assert that "ineradicable differences of race ... have a divine right to exist and are ordained by Providence," but he has to draw on his own inner consciousness for a proof. To the ordinary reader of the New Testament one fact surely must be perfectly clear—that patriotism is not in itself a Christian virtue. We are to love all men

and obey our rulers, but to distinctive national sentiment there is no appeal. On the contrary, the aim of Christ and His followers would seem to have been the abolishing of national differences, the dissipation of racial prejudices and antagonisms, the breaking down of those middle walls of partition which we, with our flags and our national anthems and our customs-duties and our so-called patriotism, have toiled so successfully to rebuild. Under the Roman Empire and in the early Christian Church, men were all brothers; can we use the expression without absurdity to-day? We have "Rule Britannia" on the one hand; we have "Deutschland über alles" on the other, and we gloat over each other's misfortunes. The Talmudic legend tells us that God rebuked Miriam for her Song of Triumph: "How can ye sing when my children are perishing?" But the "good patriot" in Christian times must show no such tenderheartedness. It is indeed an era of "nationalism run mad," and the end is not yet. One need not be a pacifist to endorse Temple's noble aspiration (*op. cit.* page 60): "Here is field enough for heroism and the moral equivalent of war. The Church is to be transformed and become a band of people united in their indifference to personal success or national expansion, and caring only that the individual is pure in heart and the nation honourable." The end is not yet; but down the ages comes the echo of the great Apostle's voice, and we thank God and take courage:

"Ye have put off the old man with his deeds, and have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him: where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free; but Christ is all and in all."

Cambridge:

PRINTED BY J. B. PEACE, M.A.,
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

225.93

Buckler, G.G.

B856

National sentiment and

225.93

0

B856



T3-BNT-208

